

fault with our Church on that very account, and said that there was nothing written about Saints' days in the Bible. And the Bishops of the Church at that time answered them something like this: "That though Saints' days might not be named in the Bible, yet there was nothing said against them; and that there were many things of the same kind which all Christians were agreed in observing. For, they said that so long as any thing was *not contrary* to the Holy Scriptures, and helped to make people better Christians, no one ought to object to it. You know our Saviour observed many things that were not ordered in the Bible, such as the feast of the dedication of the Temple, (St. John x. 22.) which was only instituted between one hundred and two hundred years before He was born into this world.

Philip.—It may be so, but what has this to do with godfathers and godmothers?

John.—I was going to say the same might be said for them. Although they may not be spoken of by name in the Bible, yet you cannot say that anything is said against them; and we know that the custom of having them began most likely in the time of the Apostles themselves, or at any rate very soon after their death, when of course, Christians, were much wiser and better than they have been since. Indeed we have very nearly, if not quite, as much authority for them as we have for keeping Sunday instead of Saturday as the Jews did.

Philip.—Well, I begin to think you are in the right, and that it is well to have godfathers and godmothers, if only for the sake of keeping to the old rules of the Church; for I am not one to be wishing to break through any laws, unless I am persuaded they are quite wrong. But what is the use of having more than one? Why cannot one answer as well as three?

John.—If answering were all that they had to do, one would be enough, but besides that, they have to "see that the child be taught" its duty, and take care "that it be virtuously brought up to lead a godly and Christian life."

Philip.—That is said at the end of the Baptism service, isn't it?

John.—Yes. Well you see of course it is the parents' duty to do all this; but if they should die or neglect their child, then the godfathers and godmothers are bound to take care of it. And so every Christian child, instead of having only two persons, "to see that it be virtuously brought up," has five. It seems as if the Church appointed that there should be so many, in the hope that at least one out of the five would be able and willing to take a Christian care of the little one; and this I suppose is one reason why it is not thought well that the parents themselves should stand for their own children.

Philip.—I have heard people say that no one could be so fit to be godfathers and godmothers

as the parents, but now I see that it is very wisely ordered they should not.

John.—Some persons have got a notion that if they stand for a child, they will have to answer for all its sins until it is confirmed; but this is a very foolish mistake indeed. It seems to me that nothing can be plainer than this, that from the time we first began to know right from wrong, every one of us will have to answer for his own sins. So long as godfathers and godmothers do all they can to keep the child they have answered for from sin, there will be nothing laid to their charge.

Philip.—Well, John, I do not remember that I had any other objections to make; and as you have eased my mind about all these, I shall be very willing to answer for your child. God grant that I may do my duty by him.

Bishop Potter on the American Bible Society.

We transfer the following article to our columns from the 'Episcopal Recorder.' The editor says of it:—"As springing from a source peculiarly authoritative, it is entitled to be received with grave consideration, not only by our own communion, but by the American Bible Society itself, of which the writer has been heretofore one of the most efficient supporters." The author of it is the Bishop of Pennsylvania, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Pennsylvania Bible Society. We think his article will cause some little alarm among the managers of the American Bible Society.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY AND ITS NEW BIBLE.—In its infancy there was nothing on which this society more insisted, than that "its sole object was to promote a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment." This is its own avowal; and, to the words sole object, it gave all the prominence, by capitals which is given above. It also pledged itself at the outset that the "only copies in the English language to be circulated by the Society, shall be the version now (1816) in common use." Anxious to promote the diffusion of the Scriptures, and able, under such a system, to do it by fraternal co-operation, Protestant Christians united extensively for the purpose. Our own American Society has been the recipient of immense funds, and of these funds its managers have doubtless intended to be faithful trustees. They have scattered the leaves of this Tree of Life far and wide, and the spectacle of Christian unity and concord which they have presented has been most grateful to catholic hearts.

But in proportion as they are charged with larger funds and a more extended influence, in the same proportion it is important that they